

### **REMARKS**

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of JP 58-106836 (Aoshima et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,539,462 (Plankenhorn). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al., in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,857,699 (Duley et al.) and in view of JP 63-149092 (Tada). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,080,474 (Miyamoto). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn, in view of Duley et al., and in view of Tada and further in view of Miyamoto. Claims 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of DE 42 34 339 (Deinzer et al.). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al., in view of Plankenhorn, in view of Duley et al. and in view of Tada, and further in view of Deinzer et al. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,883,405 (Strauch). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,493,445 (Sexton).

Reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of JP 58-106836 (Aoshima et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,539,462 (Plankenhorn).

Claim 11 recites “laser hardfacing the component with a separate laser device, the heating occurring prior to and/or during the laser hardfacing.”

The APA does not disclose this feature. It is respectfully submitted that the Final Office Action is in error, in that it does not address why or how one of skill in the art would provide this feature to the APA. Laser hardfacing is not the same as annealing, and the Aoshima and Plankenhorn references also do not disclose laser hardfacing any component. Thus even a combination of APA and Aoshima and Plankenhorn would not result in the present invention as claimed. At a minimum, a new Office Action addressing the actual claim language is respectfully requested. However, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants’ admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al., in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,857,699 (Duley et al.) and in view of JP 63-149092 (Tada).

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections to claims 13 and 14 is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants’ admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,080,474 (Miyamoto).

*With further respect to claim 15, claim 15 recites* “adjusting angles of incidence at which laser radiation hit a surface of the component to the contour of said surface.” Miyamoto shapes beams but these are not adjusted “to the contour of said surface.” See, e.g., 6a of Miyamoto with its flat surface. The present invention, as described at [0018] for example advantageously adjusts the angles to the contour, for example to the contour of a turbine blade.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 15 for this reason as well is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants’ admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn, in view of Duley et al., and

in view of Tada and further in view of Miyamoto.

**Claim 16 recites** “adjusting angles of incidence at which laser radiation from the plurality of laser devices hit a plurality of surfaces of the component to the contour of each surface.” As discussed above with respect to claim 15, Miyamoto does not disclose this feature even for a single surface, much less a plurality of surfaces.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 16 for this reason as well is respectfully requested.

Claims 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants’ admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of DE 42 34 339 (Deinzer et al.). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants’ admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al., in view of Plankenhorn, in view of Duley et al. and in view of Tada, and further in view of Deinzer et al. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants’ admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,883,405 (Strauch). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants’ admitted prior art in view of Aoshima et al. in view of Plankenhorn and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,493,445 (Sexton).

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections to claims 17 to 21 is respectfully requested.

For the reasons above, withdrawal of the rejection of all claims 11 to 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

John S. Economou (Reg. No. 38,439)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940